



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/669,594	09/26/2000	Prasad Raje	004426.P001	5001

7590 03/27/2002

Blakley Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

BASHORE, WILLIAM L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/669,594	Applicant(s) Prasad Raje
	Examiner William L. Bashore	Art Unit 2176

- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 2, 2002
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-101 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-101 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) All b) Some* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 20) Other: _____

Art Unit: 2176

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment/Response filed 1/2/2002, to the original application filed 9/26/2000, with provisional filing date of 9/30/1999. IDS filed 5/4/2001.
2. The rejection to the title of the invention has been withdrawn as necessitated by Amendment/Response.
3. Claims 1-3, 6, 36, 43-44, 57-59, 76-80, 89 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang.
4. Claims 4-5, 7-35, 37-38, 45-57, 60-73, 81-88, 90-101 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang and Brandt.
5. Claims 1-101 are pending. Claims 1, 19, 28, 36, 43, 76, 81, 89 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-3, 6, 36, 43-44, 57-59, 76-80, 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (hereinafter Wang), U.S. Patent No. 5,875,332 issued February 1999.

Art Unit: 2176

In regard to independent claim 1, Wang teaches:

- receiving a form from a user (Wang column 4 lines 42-49; compare with claim 1 "*receiving a form from a user*").

- allowing a user to configure a set of actions for submission (Wang column 4 lines 43-50, 55-61; compare with claim 1 "*allowing said user to configure a set of actions to be performed in processing a submission of said form, comprising:*").

- parsing a form to extract form elements along with associated logic (Wang column 4 lines 54-67, column 5 lines 1-10; compare with claim 1 "*parsing said form to extract specifications of form elements contained in said form*").

- Wang does not specifically teach presenting to a user an interface for a user to input specification. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Wang, because Wang teaches that a developer need only to write an input form and a stored procedure (Wang column 2 lines 29-33; compare with claim 1 "*presenting said user with a user interface....processing said submission of said form*"), suggesting the creation of said form and procedure by a user via an interface, and providing the advantage of an interface to create and submit necessary items.

- creation of a CGI module for obtaining specification for said set of actions (Wang column 1 lines 45-52; compare with claim 1 "*obtaining specification for said set of actions from said user*").

- customization of a CGI module adapted to a configuration structure of a stored procedure (Wang column 1 lines 44-45, column 4 lines 40-45; compare with claim 1 "*generating a configuration structure....actions to be performed.*").

Art Unit: 2176

In regard to dependent claims 2, 3, 6, Wang teaches generation of a customized CGI program (Wang column 2 lines 30-35; compare with claim 2). Wang teaches web access to databases via CGI interfaces (Wang column 1 lines 13-17; compare with claim 3). Wang teaches a customized CGI module consistent with a stored procedure and an input stream (Wang column 2 lines 29-38; compare with claim 6).

In regard to independent claim 36, Wang teaches:

- receiving a form, said form configured with a set of actions for submission, and parsing a form to extract form elements along with associated logic (Wang column 4 lines 42-49, 55-67, column 5 lines 1-10; compare with claim 36 "*a first module to parse a first form....elements contained in the first form*").
- creation and customization of a CGI module for obtaining specification from a user for a set of actions, said customization of a CGI module adapted to a configuration structure of a stored procedure (Wang column 1 lines 45-52, column 4 lines 40-45; compare with claim 36 "*a second module to obtain from the first author....program for the first form.*").
- Wang does not specifically teach configuring a program. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Wang, because Wang teaches CGI to customize a stored procedure, which suggests customization of a program, and providing the advantage of CGI customization (Wang column 1 lines 40-59; compare with claim 36 "*configure a first program*").

In regard to dependent claims 39-42, Wang teaches a CGI module for extracting logic (functions) from a file, and from a stored procedure, and Wang teaches a customized CGI module consistent with a

Art Unit: 2176

stored procedure and an input stream (Wang column 2 lines 29-38, column 4 lines 50-67; compare with claims 39-42).

In regard to independent claim 43, Wang teaches:

- receiving a submitted form from a user from another site (Wang column 4 lines 42-49; compare with claim 43 “*allowing a first author....said allowing comprising*”, and “*receiving the first form at a first server*”).

- parsing a form to extract form elements along with associated logic (Wang column 4 lines 54-67, column 5 lines 1-10; compare with claim 43 “*parsing said form to extract specifications of form elements contained in said form*”).

- Wang does not specifically teach creating a representation of form elements. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Wang, because Wang teaches that a developer need only to write an input form and a stored procedure, said procedure invoked by an input stream (Wang column 2 lines 29-33; compare with claim 43 “*creating a representation....extracted from the first form*”), suggesting the representation of an invoked program to a user, and providing the advantage of an interface to create and submit necessary items.

- allowing a user to configure a set of actions for submission (Wang column 4 lines 43-50, 55-61; compare with claim 43 “*obtaining configuration information from the first user*”).

- creation of a CGI module for obtaining specification for said set of actions (Wang column 1 lines 45-52; compare with claim 1 “*obtaining specification for said set of actions from said user*”).

Art Unit: 2176

- customization of a CGI module adapted to a configuration structure of a stored procedure (Wang column 1 lines 44-45, column 4 lines 40-45; compare with claim 43 “configuring the first program’s*by the first author.*”).

In regard to dependent claim 44, claim 44 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 43, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 57-59, Wang teaches generating HTML web pages, as well as a CGI module parsing through an HTML form (Wang column 1 lines 10-20, column 4 lines 40-47; compare with claims 57-59).

In regard to independent claim 76, Wang teaches:

- receiving a form from a user (Wang column 4 lines 42-49; compare with claim 76 “*receiving a form from a user*”).

- allowing a user to configure a set of actions for submission (Wang column 4 lines 43-50, 55-61; compare with claim 76 “*allowing said user to configure a set of actions to be performed in processing a submission of said form, comprising:*”).

- parsing a form to extract form elements along with associated logic (Wang column 4 lines 54-67, column 5 lines 1-10; compare with claim 76 “*parsing said form to extract specifications of form elements contained in said form*”).

- Wang does not specifically teach presenting to a user an interface for a user to input specification. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 2176

invention, in view of Wang, because Wang teaches that a developer need only to write an input form and a stored procedure (Wang column 2 lines 29-33; compare with claim 76 “*presenting said user with a user interface....processing said submission of said form*”), suggesting the creation of said form and procedure by a user via an interface, and providing the advantage of an interface to create and submit necessary items.

- creation of a CGI module for obtaining specification for said set of actions (Wang column 1 lines 45-52; compare with claim 76 “*obtaining specification for said set of actions from said user*”).
- customization of a CGI module adapted to a configuration structure of a stored procedure (Wang column 1 lines 44-45, column 4 lines 40-45; compare with claim 76 “*generating a configuration structure....actions to be performed.*”).

In regard to dependent claims 77-80, Wang teaches generation of a CGI module customized to a stored procedure (extraction of logical elements), said module also customized to parse elements from an input form for the purpose of invoking said procedure (Wang column 3 lines 15-35, column 4 lines 38-67; compare with claims 77-80).

In regard to independent claim 89, Wang teaches:

- receiving a form from a user, and allowing a user to configure a set of actions for submission (Wang column 4 lines 43-50, 55-61; compare with claim 89 “*allowing a first author.... of the first form, said allowing comprising:*”, and “*receiving the first form at a first server*”).
- parsing a form to extract form elements along with associated logic (Wang column 4 lines 54-67, column 5 lines 1-10; compare with claim 89 “*parsing said form to extract specifications of form elements included in the first form*”).

Art Unit: 2176

- Wang does not specifically teach creating a representation of form elements. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Wang, because Wang teaches that a developer need only to write an input form and a stored procedure, said procedure invoked by an input stream (Wang column 2 lines 29-33; compare with claim 89 “creating a representation....*extracted from the first form*”), suggesting the representation of an invoked program to a user, and providing the advantage of an interface to create and submit necessary items.

- creation of a CGI module for obtaining specification for said set of actions (Wang column 1 lines 45-52; compare with claim 89 “*obtaining configuration information from the first author*”).

- customization of a CGI module adapted to a configuration structure of a stored procedure (Wang column 1 lines 44-45, column 4 lines 40-45; compare with claim 89 “*configuring the first program's....by the first author.*”).

8. **Claims 4-5, 7-35, 37-38, 45-57, 60-73, 81-88, 90-101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (hereinafter Wang), U.S. Patent No. 5,875,332 issued February 1999, in view of Brandt et al. (hereinafter Brandt), U.S. Patent No. 5,892,905 issued April 1999.**

In regard to dependent claim 4, Wang does not specifically teach Java applets. However, Brandt teaches Java applets (Brandt column 6 lines 8-10; compare with claim 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Brandt to Wang, because of Brandt’s taught advantage of Java, providing Wang the advantage of a platform independent language.

Art Unit: 2176

In regard to dependent claim 5, Wang teaches HTML (Wang column 2 lines 29-31; compare with claim 5).

In regard to dependent claims 7-10, Wang does not specifically teach keeping track of changes, or timestamps. However, Brandt teaches keeping track of changes (Brandt column 16 lines 20-23). Brandt teaches use of timestamps for synchronization (Brandt column 21 lines 60-63; compare with claims 7-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Brandt to Wang, because of Brandt's taught advantage of current tracking, so as to provide a user of Wang a way to keep changes current.

In regard to dependent claims 11-15, Wang teaches creation and customization of a CGI module, said module customized subsequent to changed submissions of input files and stored procedures (Wang column 2 lines 22-38; compare with claims 11-15).

In regard to dependent claim 16-18, claims 16-18 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 13-15, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 19, Wang teaches:

- receiving a form from a user (Wang column 4 lines 42-49; compare with claim 19 "*receiving a first form created by a first author....one or more field attributes*").

Art Unit: 2176

- parsing a form to extract form elements along with associated logic (Wang column 4 lines 54-67, column 5 lines 1-10; compare with claim 19 "*parsing the first form to extract specification....with each input field*").

- Wang does not specifically teach presenting to a user an interface for a user to input specification. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Wang, because Wang teaches that a developer need only to write an input form and a stored procedure (Wang column 2 lines 29-33; compare with claim 19 "*presenting to the first author a user interface*"), suggesting the creation of said form and procedure by a user via an interface, and providing the advantage of an interface to create and submit necessary items.

- Wang does not specifically teach an invoked procedure comprising a set of questions. However, Brandt teaches a template CGI processed user interface presented with rental options (Brandt column 23 lines 45-60; compare with claim 19 "*a set of questions*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Brandt to Wang, because of Brandt's taught advantage of CGI processed interactive web pages, providing a user of Wang a way to create interactive applications.

- creation and customization of a CGI module adapted to a configuration structure of a stored procedure for obtaining specification for said set of actions, allowing a user to configure a set of actions for submission (Wang column 4 lines 43-50, 55-61, column 1 lines 45-52; compare with claim 19 "*that are constructed based upon the extracted....submissions of the first form*").

In regard to dependent claims 20-24, Wang teaches creation and submission of stored procedures and input streams utilizing forms (Wang column 2 lines 22-39; compare with claims 20-24).

Art Unit: 2176

In regard to dependent claims 25-27, claims 25-27 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 6, 9, and 10, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 28, Wang teaches:

- receiving a form from a user, and parsing a form to extract form elements along with associated logic (Wang column 4 lines 54-67, column 5 lines 1-10 column 4 lines 42-49; compare with claim 19 “*first programming logic to parse....attributes of the input fields*”).

- Wang does not specifically teach presenting to a user an interface for a user to input specification.

However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Wang, because Wang teaches that a developer need only to write an input form and a stored procedure (Wang column 2 lines 29-33; compare with claim 28 “*presenting to the first author a user interface*”), suggesting the creation of said form and procedure by a user via an interface, and providing the advantage of an interface to create and submit necessary items.

- Wang does not specifically teach an invoked procedure comprising a set of questions. However, Brandt teaches a template CGI processed user interface presented with rental options (Brandt column 23 lines 45-60; compare with claim 28 “*a set of questions*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Brandt to Wang, because of Brandt’s taught advantage of CGI processed interactive web pages, providing a user of Wang a way to create interactive applications.

- creation and customization of a CGI module adapted to a configuration structure of a stored procedure for obtaining specification for said set of actions, allowing a user to configure a set of actions for submission (Wang column 4 lines 43-50, 55-61, column 1 lines 45-52; compare with claim 28 “*configuration information with respect to....submission of the first form.* ”).

Art Unit: 2176

In regard to dependent claims 29-31, Wang teaches a configuration structure parsed via CGI, and performed actions (Wang column 1 lines 45-55; compare with claims 29-31).

In regard to dependent claims 32-35, Wang teaches CGI for processing submissions of forms. teaches consistency by returning results consistent with a user's submitted request (Wang Abstract). Wang teaches a customized CGI module consistent with a stored procedure and an input stream (Wang column 2 lines 29-38; compare with claims 32-35).

In regard to dependent claims 37-38, Wang does not specifically teach an invoked procedure comprising a set of questions. However, Brandt teaches a template CGI processed user interface presented with rental options (Brandt column 23 lines 45-60; compare with claims 37-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Brandt to Wang, because of Brandt's taught advantage of CGI processed interactive web pages, providing a user of Wang a way to create interactive applications.

In regard to dependent claims 45-56, Wang does not specifically teach form validation, quantity generation, licensing, cookies, or email. However, Brandt teaches password validation, multiple applications, licensing, cookie generation, and email (Brandt column 6 lines 10-14, column 23 lines 45-54, column 24 lines 30-36; compare with claims 45-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Brandt to Wang, because of Brandt's taught advantage of passwords, email, and licensing, providing a user of Wang a way to incorporate popular elements of the Internet.

Art Unit: 2176

In regard to dependent claims 60-73, claims 60-73 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 43, 45-56, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 74-75, Wang does not specifically teach email. However, Brandt teaches email (Brandt column 6 lines 8-13; compare with claims 74-75). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Brandt to Wang, because of Brandt's taught advantage of email, providing a user of Wang a way to incorporate popular elements of the Internet.

In regard to independent claim 81, Wang teaches:

- receiving a form from a user (Wang column 4 lines 42-49; compare with claim 81 "*receiving a first form created by a first author....one or more field attributes*").
- parsing a form to extract form elements along with associated logic (Wang column 4 lines 54-67, column 5 lines 1-10; compare with claim 81 "*parsing the first form to extract specification....with each input field*").
- Wang does not specifically teach presenting to a user an interface for a user to input specification.

However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Wang, because Wang teaches that a developer need only to write an input form and a stored procedure (Wang column 2 lines 29-33; compare with claim 81 "*presenting to the first author a user interface*"), suggesting the creation of said form and procedure by a user via an interface, and providing the advantage of an interface to create and submit necessary items.

- Wang does not specifically teach an invoked procedure comprising a set of questions. However, Brandt teaches a template CGI processed user interface presented with rental options (Brandt column 23

Art Unit: 2176

lines 45-60; compare with claim 81 “*a set of questions*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Brandt to Wang, because of Brandt’s taught advantage of CGI processed interactive web pages, providing a user of Wang a way to create interactive applications.

- creation and customization of a CGI module adapted to a configuration structure of a stored procedure for obtaining specification for said set of actions, allowing a user to configure a set of actions for submission (Wang column 4 lines 43-50, 55-61, column 1 lines 45-52; compare with claim 81 “*allowing the first author to specify one or more....submissions of the first form*”).

In regard to dependent claims 82-88, claims 82-88 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 20-27, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 90-101, claims 90-101 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 45-56, and are rejected along the same rationale.

9. Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to disclosure.

Hitchcock et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,345,278 issued 2/2002

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 1/2/2002 have been fully and carefully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on pages 4-7 of the Amendment/Response (hereinafter the Response) that the cited art of record do not teach the claimed limitations regarding allowing a user to configure a set of actions to be

Art Unit: 2176

performed in a submission of a form comprising presenting said user with a user interface to allow said user to input specification for said set of actions to be performed in processing said submission of said form (similar arguments are presented on pages 7-11).

The Examiner notes that Wang teaches stored procedures and input forms read by customized CGI adapters. Wang teaches a user initiating a call resulting in a displayed HTML input form (Wang column 2 lines 65-67 to column 3 lines 1-3). Said user then selects various functions and/or data input prior to submitting said form, the resulting data is then parsed by said adapter into string variables (Wang column 3 lines 4-8, 43-49). It is additionally noted that the builder program of Wang generates logic to extract variables from HTML form data (corresponding to arguments of a stored procedure), with said logic also including logic to determine the type of method used to input the input data stream, etc. (Wang column 5 lines 1-12). The builder invokes a stored procedure using the variables extracted from user data. Even taking into account pre-existing stored procedures, the builder uses a user's form input data to customize a CGI adapter program, therefore, the input data can be interpreted within Wang as helping to define the customization of said adapter. The Examiner uses Brandt to teach a template CGI processed user interface presented with rental options (including questions), as claimed in independent claims 19, 28, and 81 (see Brandt column 27 lines 8-12).

In additional support of the above rejections, Brandt teaches a series of HTML screens whereby particular variables are passed from one screen to the next, for tracking a user's interaction with an application (Brandt column 16 lines 16-23). Brandt also teaches a reservation system to determine if a user inputted request can be filled according to said user's request (Brandt column 27 lines 5-11). The inputted data acts to specify a customized search pattern to confirm a car rental.

Art Unit: 2176

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Bashore whose telephone number is (703) 308-5807. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 11:30 AM to 8:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Art Unit: 2176

13. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

**(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")**

or:

(703) 746-7238 (for after-final communications)

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).**

William L. Bashore
03/13/2002

Joseph H. Feild
JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER